

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 94 04:30:12 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #317  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 19 Jul 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    317

Today's Topics:

  Color SSVT  
                    Emergency TX on police freq. (2 msgs)  
  reply  
  The Patch  
                    The Universal CW Thread  
  Thoughts on CW testing

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.  
-----

Date: 19 Jul 94 14:01:42 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Color SSVT  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Hello Gang,

I am posting this question, after a friend of mine (sv1bto) informed me about t  
his. Any answers will be greatly appreciated from both of us. Here it goes :

SV1BT0 is interested in purchasing a TNC. He is considering AEA's PK232 or PK90  
0and the MFJ 's equivalent. His main interest is tcp/ip operation \*AND\* SSTV,WE  
FAX etc. He's been told that AEA's products, although they can support the  
modes he wants, do not have any software available for them, that will send and  
receive \*color\* images. In short, the h/w is ok but no s/w to do it. Is this t  
rue? I found it rather difficult to believe, that no one has written an SSTV

or WEFAX program to send and receive color, using AEA's TNCs. On the other hand, MFJ's comes complete with software that supports color and this seems to be remarkable.

My personal interest in the story lies simply in the fact that I presently own a PK232, and I thought that it supported all modes. Not yet involved in SSTV etc, but plan to in the near future.

If you have any idea about it, we would appreciate your opinion, product suggestions etc.

PLEASE, due to summer vacations, reply directly to my e-mail address at home.

Best 73 de John (SV1CEC)

```
+-----+
| John Caradimas      | email: sv1cec@athnet.ath.forthnet.gr (home) |
| P.O.Box 31689       | jcaradim@gr.oracle.com (office) |
| Athens 100-35 GREECE | tel. : +(301)-6451541 (h) +(301)-8831511 (o) |
+-----+
|  DISCLAIMER : For all these, you can only blame me, nobody else!  |
+-----+
```

-----

Date: Mon, 18 Jul 94 21:57:32 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!cherry.atlanta.com!spcuna!  
starcomm.overleaf.com!n2ayj!n2ayj@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Emergency TX on police freq.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>... a case in So. California...  
> He had his radio (license as well?) taken away,  
>The owner of the HT was given the OPTION of either turning over  
>his radio or face an FCC hearing; an FCC official was present  
>  
>Everytime this tale gets retold the story changes a bit!  
>

Ooo-ooooooo-weeeee-oooo (<--spooky music), The "Hookman of Ham Radio" Lives! ;{)  
Didn't Newsline and Spectrum put this guy to rest YET?

--  
Stan Olochwoszcz, N2AYJ - n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com  
"Please keep your seat belt securely fastened, keep hands and feet inside the car at all times, secure loose items, exit to your right, and enjoy your day at

SixFlagsDisneyKing's GreatMagicDominionIsland BerryFarmGardensParkWorldLand."

-----  
Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 01:28:34 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!  
F180-196.net.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Emergency TX on police freq.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <Csspto.30D@csn.org> joelf@csn.org (Joel F. Frederick) writes:  
>From: joelf@csn.org (Joel F. Frederick)  
>Subject: Re: Emergency TX on police freq.  
>Date: Mon, 11 Jul 1994 21:46:36 GMT

>John O. Feher (feher@netcom.com) wrote:

>: A question to all:

>:       Suppose a ham radio operator is in a  
>: life-threatening emergency with a modified radio  
>: in his hand. Should he attempt to call/break in  
>: on a public safety (ie police) dispatch freq.

>: Would this be legal in case of a true e,mergency?  
>: Would it work or are such main dispatch frequencies  
>: "protected" by some squelch system?

>I believe that I read a of a case in So. California where this happened,  
>if memory serve, the guy tried repeaters & cell phones and finally made  
>the call on public safety freq's. He had his radio (license as well?)  
>taken away, the justification was that it was not FCC type accepted for  
>those frequencies.

>Joel  
>KG0IL

I think only his radio was taken away. It was the local police that asked  
for the action. The FCC was understanding but still took the radio. I hope  
we talking about the same case.

Bruce  
WA2DEU

-----  
Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 02:31:46 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!news.eecs.nwu.edu!ahab.eecs.nwu.edu!  
hpa@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: reply

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Followup to: <9406187745.AA774558455@mails.imed.com>

By author: mack@mails.imed.COM (Mack Ray)

In newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy

>

> First the question: What the heck is IMHO? Can we PLEASE use  
> English (or at least American)? We don't need to save that many  
> bytes that we can't spell out exactly what we mean. To do  
> otherwise distracts from the message you are trying to send.

IMHO = In My Humble Opinion. It is a very common piece of net.jargon;  
in fact quite a few net.addicts I know (including myself) use it at  
least occationally in speech, just like many hams use Q-codes and say  
"73".

> N9ITP must have sent in his suggestion about the same time as me.  
> "Great minds think alike!" (Modesty is my best quality!)

: -)

> The only reason I suggested leaving the current testing alone was  
> to make it easy for the FCC. They seem to have a great deal of  
> inertia for adding new things. Rearranging what they have seems  
> to go much easier. I base this on the comments and rationale  
> they used to add the no-code techs. I agree with Ken and N9ITP  
> that a more difficult technical exam would be more appropriate to  
> a technical ladder license.

I tend to agree with this in principle; the FCC would most likely  
refuse any major reorganization of the testing procedure; such as the  
"over-the-air" testing that occationally is proposed.

> My point is that right now if one wants to further the radio arts  
> on the longer wavelengths as an amateur, he must waste time and  
> effort to become proficient at a skill (13 wpm CW) which does  
> not, by itself, contribute to furthering the radio art.

Indeed.

> >Seems to me we have many great assets now and we'd have even  
> >more  
> >in the future if we reduced the CW emphasis (pass/fail) of the  
> >current testing requirements (NOTE - I didn't say eliminate all  
> >CW  
> >testing...I've said reduce the emphasis. How do you reduce the  
> >emphasis?  
> >You either lower the code speed requirements while retaining the

> >separate element requirement OR you integrate the 10 CW  
> questions >into  
> >the total test score and score the combined on a 75% correct  
> >basis.  
>  
> Bill, this is an idea that hadn't even occurred to me. That is  
> an excellent alternative to my proposal. I hope we get some  
> discussion on this possibility. Hopefully those of us who are  
> focusing on how to merge and modify the current excessive  
> emphasis on CW can find some middle ground between those that  
> would throw CW out entirely and those who believe CW should  
> remain as it is. I believe both of those views represent the  
> extremes of the spectrum of thought on CW. I wonder how many of  
> us are somewhere in the middle.  
>  
> If there are enough of us in the middle, why don't we make some  
> sort of a proposal for a dual ladder to the FCC? I have been  
> really reluctant to make a solo request, since I am only a  
> technician. It might seem rather self serving. I had intended  
> to get my advanced ticket the current way before making this an  
> official request. However, I got married and have 3 kids under 4  
> that take almost all of my spare time. So much for code  
> practice.

I really think we have an idea going here... I think we should try to  
get a proposal hammered out and maybe submit to the ARRL and/or the  
FCC.

/hpa

--

INTERNET: hpa@nwu.edu FINGER/TALK: hpa@ahab.eecs.nwu.edu  
IBM MAIL: I0050052 at IBMMAIL HAM RADIO: N9ITP or SM4TKN  
FIDONET: 1:115/511 or 1:115/512 STORMNET: 181:294/101 Allah-u-abha  
ICMP: The protocol that goes PING!

-----

Date: 18 Jul 1994 17:46:37 -0700  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!  
apple.com!apple.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: The Patch  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

KY1TLuck@aol.COM writes:

>Thus, if the last name of the control operator is "Dominoe", well...

Aaarrrrggghhhhh! Dan Quayl(e) is a ham!

: -) : -)

Kok Chen, AA6TY                      kchen@apple.com  
Apple Computer, Inc.

-----

Date: Mon, 18 Jul 94 22:27:08 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!emory!cherry.atlanta.com!spcuna!  
starcomm.overleaf.com!n2ayj!n2ayj@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: The Universal CW Thread  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

\*\*\*READER ADVISOR: Place tongue firmly in cheek.\*\*\*

I propose that the following topics be moved to this thread:

1. CW as a pre-req (or not)
2. CW as a fun mode (or not)
3. CW as a spectrum efficient mode (or not)
4. CW anything else!

This conversation is EVERYWHERE.  
The redundancies are making me CRAZY.  
I'm don't have time to track them all down!  
I'm out of disk space! ARRRGGHH!

BTW, I 1) agree that it (CW) should be a requirement only for those who want  
code privileges, 2) enjoy it, am not real good at it, but use it when I can,  
3) disagree that it is the most "efficient", because no one has yet set  
the parameters on "efficient" for the sake of this discussion, IMO.

What d'ya think, sirs? (Oh, sorry, that's rec.arts.tv.mst3k...) :{)

--

Stan Olochwoszcz, N2AYJ - n2ayj@n2ayj.overleaf.com  
"Please keep your seat belt securely fastened, keep hands and feet inside the  
car at all times, secure loose items, exit to your right, and enjoy your day at  
SixFlagsDisneyKing's GreatMagicDominionIsland BerryFarmGardensParkWorldLand."

-----

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 01:53:26 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primate.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!

F180-196.net.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Thoughts on CW testing  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <306t78\$19j@agate.berkeley.edu> kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken A. Nishimura) writes:

>From: kennish@kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU (Ken A. Nishimura)  
>Subject: Re: Thoughts on CW testing  
>Date: 15 Jul 1994 20:57:12 GMT

>What stymies me to this day is why the entire 50 MHz and up spectrum  
>is given to anyone passing the Tech exam.

To which Tech exam are you referring do? The no-code Tech exam, Tech PLUS (post-1987) exam or the Tech PLUS (pre-1986) exam. I am a Tech PLUS (pre-1986), I have the General theory elements (pre-1986), now all I need is the code. If you are worried about Techs getting the full spectrum (50 MHz ->) then you have to worry about the General class also! Please clarify this statment....thank you.

I assume you mean the present day Tech exam.

Bruce Micales WA2DEU

Bruce Micales WA2DEU :-)

-----

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 01:09:03 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <3061sk\$7ne@news.iastate.edu>, <405@ted.win.net>,  
<30ehqb\$ofg@news.iastate.edu>  
Subject : Re: Does CW as a pre-req

In article <30ehqb\$ofg@news.iastate.edu> twp77@isuvax.iastate.edu writes:

>In article <405@ted.win.net>, mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>>Wow. Do yourself a favor and spend a couple of hours in the library  
>>convincing yourself that you can get statistically valid results by  
>>sampling a population. After all, these methods are being used every  
>>day in ways that affect our lives, so you might as well become  
>>convinced that they work.

>

>I know such methods work. However, this is not what Jeff says he has done.

>There are too many variables in what he sampled, and he claims his "scientific"

>method gives this result. What he has done is not scientific in the least.

Hmmm, no name nor call again. I don't know what to call you other than Mr. 3061sk\$7ne:

If you are a licensed ham (if not, why are you even in this discussion?) and if you have an HF receiver then it's simple to repeat my experiment as many times as you have time for; the more counts done on the various bands at various times of day will yield will an accurate picture of the real-time QSO situation.

I never stated my methodology so how can you say that it wasn't scientific? I also never used the word ``scientific'' nor ever claimed my results to be ``scientific'' - I'm just telling everyone my observations. It's not nice to falsely attribute comments to someone, then not sign your name!

Just like the false F=C article on .misc your imagination has run wild.

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 00:45:18 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <303o5f\$80d@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <CsyEz4.2MK@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <1994Jul18.135928.10634@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: Re: Does CW as a pre-req REALLY Work?

In article <1994Jul18.135928.10634@ke4zv.atl.ga.us> gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman) writes:

>In article <CsyEz4.2MK@news.Hawaii.Edu> jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu (Jeffrey Herman) writes:

>>

>>2. Example: The Northern California QRP Club, NorCal, produced a

>>40M CW-only transceiver kit (\$70); at least 300 units were

>>produced - supplies were depleted within a short time.

>

>Gee, a whole 300 units. GRAPES has shipped an order of magnitude

>more 56 kb RF modem kits than that, and that's a highly specialized

>unit.

Ouch! Something important seems to have been cut from my statement above: ``I could give more examples...'' or something like that. If I listed them all the article would have been too long. Want



to guess how many clubs around the nation have produced kits?

Watch that editing, my friend.

There is very little we agree on, Gary, but setting that all aside  
I hope your home survived the floods.

73,  
Jeff NH6IL

-----

Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 01:25:30 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!saimiri.primite.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!  
F180-196.net.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <Css6zp.A8C@wang.com>, <071194150301Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,  
<CssMMB.1Gp@wang.com>  
Subject : Re: Emergency TX on police freq.

In article <CssMMB.1Gp@wang.com> dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong) writes:

>From: dbushong@wang.com (Dave Bushong)  
>Subject: Re: Emergency TX on police freq.  
>Date: Mon, 11 Jul 1994 20:37:22 GMT

>dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>>What I think (or you, or the ARRL or whoever) is irrelevant. What matters  
>>is how the FCC will interpret it.

>Not true. If I'm in a life-threatening situation (which is, I think,  
>where this started), what \*I\* think matters more (at least, to me)  
>than what a rule book says.

>I'd rather lose my ham license than lose my life.

>Dave, KZ10

>(but I'd rather keep both, thank you)

>--

>Dave Bushong, Wang Imaging

Ditto... I am sure the FCC would understand (at least I hope they  
would! :- ) ).

Bruce Micales WA2DEU

-----  
Date: Tue, 19 Jul 1994 06:19:34 GMT  
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <071194150301Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>, <CssMMB.1Gp@wang.com>,  
<bmicales.140.2E2B2B89@facstaff.wisc.edu>, [f3](#)  
Subject : Re: Emergency TX on police freq.

Here's an idea: If your HT will transmit and receive on 156.80 MHz and if you live near the coast or a large lake, then in life/death situations you'll be able to call for and receive help on that frequency. It is the international distress and calling channel of the VHF marine band. Along the coasts it is monitored by all Coast Guard stations, state, county, and municipal marine agencies such as harbor patrols, and even lifeguard agencies. It is a civilian-to-government frequency so you won't get in any trouble with the local authorities if you need to use it (although the FCC might want to know why you're not holding a shipboard license, and why you transmitted from an inland location).

You probably won't get your HT taken away from you like you would if you transmitted on the sheriff's frequency.

Note that the Coast Guard's remote bases are located atop choice mountaintops along the coast and coverage is continuous along the coasts and offshore to 50-100 miles; no claims are made as to their inland coverage, though.

I'll deny I ever posted this article... (someone else was using my account!)

Jeff NH6IL

-----  
Date: 19 Jul 1994 07:47:32 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!  
newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!news1.oakland.edu!condor.ic.net!grex.cyberspace.org!  
mcs@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <306g76\$20i@news.u.washington.edu>,  
<1994Jul15.205054.1463@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <3074ud\$c2h@news.u.washington.edu>ex

Subject : Re: 11 meters taking it back!!

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNED MESSAGE-----

Well, you're lucky if you've got a orderly 2-meter band. Here in Michigan we have:

- 1) Intermod from 159-MHz Paging Systems
- 2) "Repeater Idiots": syn., jammers, bootleggers, ham-wanna-be's
- 3) Intermod from commerical repeaters on the same towers as amateur repeaters.

It's a pain, beleive me. <G>

73 de KB8RBF

-----BEGIN PGP SIGNATURE-----

Version: 2.3

iQCVAgUBLizkZ53s65i04xhVAQFIbgP/cm71ZCl8cIiPhXnYpg5Vqig9CGZqBRCv  
P2qCaUC3ZiuCb1bJlH9PazWg+v1e/80XJSnJkAJhzqqITmx2jdEHRQUBMQ9CN7+7  
gzn10RxuURTyAXWZoFqQv5EErrqWeWZQcJXCiRw1dG2IIqyJ2HkcxDIGtuC+l6IK  
hJTGf0P14J8=  
=AiGg

-----END PGP SIGNATURE-----

```
-----
Nicholas R. McLarty      mcs@grex.cyberspace.org      PGP Fingerprint
KB8RBF/5                 kb8rbf@hamgate.merit.edu      C8 8D 9A D6 E2 7A
Waterford, Michigan      BE 61 63 D5 11
PGP Key Available by fingering mcs@cyberspace.org 6B 5F AC 7E 2B
or by E-mailing me at one of the addresses above
-----
```

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #317

\*\*\*\*\*